

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the final Office Action mailed on March 28, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 4-10, 12, 14, 17, 26, 30 and 55 are amended, no claims are newly canceled or added; as a result, claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 remain pending in this application.

Double Patenting Rejection

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57, and 60-63 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U. S. Patent No. 6,366,912 to Wallent et al. (“Wallent”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,010,681 to Fletcher et al. (“Fletcher”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Further, Applicant wishes to point out that the rejection should not have been a provisional rejection because the conflicting claims have been patented, contrary to the statement of item 14 on page 5 of the Final Office Action. In particular, the claims of Wallent are patented and the claims of Fletcher are patented.

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner seems to indicate that the double patenting rejection is a provisional rejection because the instant application has not yet been patented. Using such logic, all double patenting rejections would be provisional because such rejections would only be applied to pending applications. Applicant submits that the Examiner misclassified the rejection as a provisional rejection.

Page 5 of the Final Office Action states that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Wallent with Fletcher to further protect the system of Wallent from downloaded content. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Wallent relates to network browsing software and, in particular, to methods and systems for providing security when accessing network sites (see Wallent, at col. 1, lines 4-6). Wallent, at col. 2, lines 10-19, discloses that some software components transferred over the World Wide Web perform undesired operations, such as malicious operations. Thus, Wallent addresses the above-mentioned problem by configuring a Web browser to establish multiple security zones, wherein each security zone corresponds to a set of Web sites (Wallent, at col. 2, lines 55-57).

Each zone has a corresponding set of security settings that indicate actions to be performed when a corresponding protected operation is to be performed in response to receiving a Web document (Wallent, at col. 2, lines 57-60). For example, the Web browser may perform a protected operation or prevent the performance of the protected operation in accordance with a corresponding security setting (Wallent, at col. 3, lines 6-10). Thus, Applicant submits that Wallent is concerned with protecting a processing device from malicious operation based on a level of trust of a source that provides content to the Web browser.

Fletcher addresses a completely different problem. Fletcher is related to encryption, and in particular, a method, system and apparatus for selecting encryption levels based on policy profiling and client device capabilities (Fletcher, at col. 2, lines 31-34). Fletcher discloses filtering out sections within a document if a user is not authorized to see the sections, or the device is not sufficiently secure to receive the sections (Fletcher, at col. 3, lines 6-8). Fletcher discloses encrypting remaining sections within the document using a selected encryption mechanism (Fletcher, at col. 3, lines 8-12). Thus, Applicant submits that Fletcher is concerned with the disclosure of sensitive information only to authorized individuals using devices capable of providing a required level of protection or encryption. Further, Applicant submits that Fletcher discloses that documents are received from a document database (see Fletcher, at col. 4, lines 26-27). Applicant submits that the document database includes sensitive information and is analogous to a trusted source. That is, at least for security reasons, unauthorized individuals are not permitted to access or tamper with the information included within the document database. Therefore, Fletcher is not concerned with protecting, from malicious code, a device for viewing documents.

Because Wallent and Fletcher are concerned with very different problems, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Wallent with Fletcher to further protect the system of Wallent from downloaded content, as suggested on page 5 of the Final Office Action.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-18, 26-30, 32-48, 55-57 and 60-63 be withdrawn.

Further, amended claim 1 is directed to a method including, among other things, controlling page output corresponding to at least part of content by: 1) disabling or enabling execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to at least one part of the

page based on a first set of security settings; and 2) disabling or enabling execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings.

As discussed previously, Wallent discloses configuring a Web browser to establish multiple security zones, wherein each security zone corresponds to a set of websites. However, Wallent fails to disclose or suggest controlling page output corresponding to at least part of content by: 1) disabling or enabling execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings; and 2) disabling or enabling execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, as required by claim 1.

As previously discussed, Fletcher discloses filtering out sections within a document if users are not authorized to see the sections, or the device is not sufficiently secure to receive the sections. However, Fletcher also fails to disclose or suggest controlling page output corresponding to at least part of content by: 1) disabling or enabling execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings; and 2) disabling or enabling execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, as required by claim 1.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Wallent and Fletcher fails to disclose or suggest controlling page output corresponding to at least part of content by: 1) disabling or enabling execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to at least one part of the page based on a first set of security settings; and 2) disabling or enabling execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to at least one other part of the page based on a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, as required by claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 as allegedly being provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-19 of Wallent in view of Fletcher be withdrawn.

Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-18 be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Amended claim 26 is directed to a system including, among other things, a security mechanism that associates a first security zone with a first part of content and associates a second security zone with a second part of content, the security mechanism being further operable to associate a first set of security settings with the first part of the content based on the first security zone, and associate a second set of security settings with the second part of the content based on the second security zone, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, whether execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to the first part of the content is permitted being based on the first set of security settings, and whether execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to the second part of the content is permitted being based on the second set of security settings.

Applicant submits that the above-mentioned feature of claim 26 is similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn for reasons similar to those discussed above, with respect to claim 1.

Claims 27-30 and claims 32-48 depend from claim 26, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 27-30 and claims 32-48 be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 26.

Claim 55 is directed to a markup language document including, among other things, a first set of content associated with a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings indicating whether execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to the first set of content is permitted, and a second set of content associated with a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, and the second set of security settings indicating whether execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to the second set of content is permitted.

Applicant submits that the above-mentioned feature of claim 55 is similar to the previously-discussed features of claims 1 and 26. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 55 be withdrawn for reasons similar to those discussed above, with respect to claims 1 and 26.

Claims 56 -57 and claims 60-63 depend from claim 55 directly. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 56-57 and claims 60-63 be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 55.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

On page 6 of the Final Office Action, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 55, 56 and 60-62 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Fletcher. Applicant submits that amended claims 1 and 55 obviate the rejection. Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 12, and 17 were amended either to better conform with amended claim 1 or to improve presentation.

As discussed previously, with respect to the provisional double patenting rejection, Fletcher fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. For this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Fletcher and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 9-10, 12 and 17 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-6, 9-10, 12 and 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 is directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 18 is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 55 is directed to a markup language document. The markup language document includes, among other things, a first set of content associated with a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings indicating whether execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to the first set of content is permitted, and a second set of content associated with a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, and the second set of security settings indicating whether execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to the second set of content is permitted.

Applicant submits that, at least for reasons similar to those discussed with respect to claim 1, Fletcher is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of a first set of content being associated with a first set of security settings, the first set of security settings indicating

whether execution of a first script or loading of a first control corresponding to the first set of content is permitted, and a second set of content associated with a second set of security settings, the second set of security settings being different from the first set of security settings, and the second set of security settings indicating whether execution of a second script or loading of a second control corresponding to the second set of content is permitted, as required by amended independent claim 55.

Applicant submits that Fletcher fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 55 be withdrawn.

Claims 56 and 60-62 depend from claim 55 and are not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 55. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 56 and 60-62 be withdrawn.

S103 Rejection of the Claims

On page 10 of the Final Office Action, claims 7-8, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 57 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fletcher. Applicant submits that amended independent claims 1 and 55 obviate the rejection. Claim 14 was amended only to improve presentation.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 depend from claim 1, which is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Applicant further submits that Fletcher does not suggest the features of claim 1. Claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 are patentable over Fletcher for at least these reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7, 8, 11, 13-14 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claim 57 depends from claim 55, which is not anticipated by Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 55. Applicant further submits that Fletcher does not suggest all of the features of claim 55. Therefore, claim 57 is patentable over Fletcher for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 57 be withdrawn.

On page 11 of the Final Office Action, claims 15 and 63 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Fletcher, and further in view of Edwards, “The Guide to Internet Security Zones” (“Edwards”). Applicant respectfully submits that amended

independent claims 1 and 55, from which claims 15 and 63 depend, respectively, obviate the rejection.

Claims 1 and 55 are patentable over Fletcher for at least the reasons discussed above. Edwards also fails to disclose or suggest, either separately or in combination with Fletcher, the previously discussed features of claims 1 and 55. Applicant submits that dependent claims 15 and 63 are patentable over Fletcher in view of Edwards for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 55, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 15 and 63 be withdrawn.

On page 12 of the Final Office Action, claims 26-30 and 32-48 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher, and further in view of Snell, “SAMS Teach Yourself the Internet in 24 Hours” (“Snell”). Applicant submits that amended claim 26 obviates the rejection. Claim 30 was amended only to conform with amended independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed previously, Fletcher does not disclose each and every feature of amended claim 26. Snell discloses using security zones. However, Snell also fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Fletcher. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 26 is patentable over Fletcher in view of Snell and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

Claims 27-30 and 32-48 depend from claim 26, either directly or as a base claim. Applicant submits that claims 27-30 and 32-48 are patentable over Fletcher in view of Snell for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 26. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 27-30 and 32-48 be withdrawn.


Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (425-707-9382) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation
Customer No. 22971

Date June 26, 2007

By 
Richard C. Irving
Reg. No. 38,499

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 26 day of June, 2007.

SPENCER A. BARTL

Name



Signature